

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate allowable claim 5 therein in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 1 can be found in original claim 5.

**I.      Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciation that claim 5 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 5.

**II.     35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Patent Office alleges that it is unclear how the semiconductor chip is electrically connected to the optical element. Applicants respectfully disagree with this allegation.

The electrical connection is detailed throughout the specification. Applicants direct the Patent Office's attention to page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 27 and page 18, lines 23-26 of the specification. The electrodes of the optical element and the interconnect pattern formed on the semiconductor chip (which are connected to electrodes of the chip) are electrically connected. Wires are one example of the electrical connection between the optical element and the semiconductor chip, with solder balls being another. The electrical connection is thus demonstrated by Figures 1 and 3 and throughout the specification. Moreover, as the claims themselves are quite clear in reciting the connection, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is without merit.

The Examiner has further assumed that the optical element is an opto-electronic element. The optical element may correctly be assumed to be an opto-electronic element.

**III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,125 ("Go"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above and as acknowledged by the Patent Office, claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Therefore, claim 5 has been incorporated into claim 1 so as to be allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Go. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 8 and 10 directly depend on allowable claim 1 and are thus also allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

*Leana Levin*

James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin  
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: December 8, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461